# INDEX

Of

# WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
YANO, Mitsuji (resumed)	23692
Cross by Colonel Smirnov (cont'd)	23692
MORNING RECEAS	23713
Cross by Colonel Smirnov (contt)	23718
(Witness excused)	23722

## INDEX

Of

#### EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description For Ident.	In E <b>vidence</b>
None	2709 -		Map of Manchuria and Mongolia published by the Kwantung Territory Government in September 1926 (prosecution document 2993-A previously marked for identifica- tion only)	2369-
None	2709-1		Excerpt therefrom	23694
None	2710		Map published by the Cuartermasier Depart- ment of the Kwantung Government General in 1911 (prosecution document 2993-2) 23695	23697
None	2710-A		Excerpt therefrom	23697
None	2731		Large Map of China and Managuria drawn up by the Research Scientific Department of the Society of the East Asia Culture, pub- lished by the Printing Office Fuzambo in November 1932 (prosecu- tion document 2993-B) 23698	23702
None	2711-A		Excerpt therefrom	23702
751		719B	Map (attached to exhibit No. 719)	23717
751		719C	Excerpts therefrom	23717
751		7190	Memorandum (attached to exhibit No. 719)	23718

I N D 1. X

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

		Pros.	Description	For Ident.	In Evidence
1695	2712		Telegram from the Charge d'Affaires in Moscow to the Secretary of State, Washington, dat 11 August 1938 re the	eđ	03//03
			Soviet Budget		23723
5			NOON RECESS		23730
			AFTERNOON RECESS		23752

### Friday, 6 June 1947 2 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL 3 FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal 4 War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan 6 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930. 8 9 10 Appearances: For the Tribunal, same as before. 11 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 12 For the Defense Section, same as before. 13 14, (English to Japanese and Japanese 15 16 to English interpretation was made by the 17 Language Section, IMTFE.) 18 19 20 21 22 23

Spratt & Yelden

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Smirnov.

COLONEL SMIRMOV: Your Honor, I would like to continue my cross-examination of the witness but the witness is not in the witness box as yet -- on the witness stand as yet.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: Mr. President, the witness is not available in the building this morning. I am not informed as to his whereabouts.

THE PRESIDENT: We will suspend judgment until we hear all about it.

IR. BLAKENEY: The witness is waiting in the witness room and is now coming.

15

16

17

18

MITSUJI YANO, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as collows: CROSS-EXAMINATION

19

BY COLONEL SMIRNOV (Continued):

22

23

24

25

21

Q Witness, look at the markings on the map which was handed to you yesterday. Look at the inscription, at the marking in the left bottom corner of the map.

Was this map published by the Kwantung

	Territory Government, was it?
	MR. BLAKENEY: May I ask which of the maps
ŀ	handed to the witness yesterday is now under discussion?
	COLONEL SMIRNOV: This map was handed to
	the witness at the end of the session yesterday.
l	This is the map published in September, 1926, and
	is the map of Manchuria and Mongolia. It was published
	by the Kwantung Territory Government.
	Q Do you say that this map was published in
	September, 1926 by the Kwantung Territory Government?
	A Yes, I do.
	Q Is the meaning of the markings on the map
ŀ	and the points of the compass on this map clear to you?
	A I do.
	9 Find on the map the area of the Buirnor
	Lake and the Halha River and the area of the Halha
	River.
ŀ	A Yes, I found it I found them.
l	Q Is it clear to you that the border line
-	as marked on this map passes east of the Halha River,
	that is, in accordance with the assertions of the

A On this map that fact is very plain.

excerpts from this map in evidence -- the excerpts of

COLONEL SMIRNOV: I offer this map and the

Mongolian and Soviet side?

24

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

this map served upon the Tribunal and the defense. THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney. MR. BLAKENEY: I would like to have a look at the original before it is offered. COLONEL SMIRNOV: This map was taken from Imperial Library in Tokyo and a certificate to that effect is attached to the map and was served on the Court. MR. BLAKENEY: No objection. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 2993-A is now received in evidence and retains the same exhibit number, being 2709, and the excerpt therefrom will be given 2709-A. (Whereupon, prosecution exhibit No. 2709 for identification and the excerpt therefrom being marked No. 2709-A were received in evidence.)

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Now I want to pass on to some previous time and refer to the map published in 1911 by the Kwantung Army.

I tender this map published by the Quartermaster Department of the Kwantung Army. I offer this map published by the Quartermaster Office of the ground forces of the Kwantung Territory in 1911 for

22

21

23

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

20

19

21 22

23 24

25

identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document
No. 2993-D will receive exhibit No. 2710 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 2710 for identification only.)

COLONEL SMIRNOV: May I ask to send the copies of the map to the Members of the Tribunal and the original of the map to the witness.

RUSSIAN INTERPRETER: Correction, please, to the previous statement of the Soviet prosecutor: instead of "Kwantung Territory" it should be "Kwantung Government General."

COLONEL SMIRNOV: I should like to ask the witness to look at the map in such a way that something remains from it. May the map be shown to the witness.

Q Mr. Witness, pay attention to the inscriptions on this map. Do you see that it was published by the Quartermaster Department of the Kwantung Army in 1911?

RUSSIAN INTERPRETER: Not "Quartermaster" but "Intendance Department of the Kwantung Army."

A No, that is not so.

Q By whom then?

A No, that is not so. This map was issued by the Kwantung Government General -- prepared by the Kwantung Government General.

Q Is it said on this map that it was drawn up by an officer, by an intendance officer of the first class, Torchiro and Asahi, and published by the intendance department of the ground forces of the Kwantung Government General in 1911, in September, 1911?

A. The prosecutor has confused the Kwantung Army and the Kwantung Government General.

Q Then you say that this map was published by the Kwantung Government General, don't you?

A Yes.

Q Find on this map the Buirnor Lake and the Halha River.

A Yes, I found it.

Q Have you found out that on this map the border line passes to the east of the Halha River, that is, in accordance with contentions of the Soviet-Mongolian side?

A It is so on this map.

Q Now let us consider another map. I am sorry -- I tender this map and the copies of the parts of this map in evidence. They were tendered

-

3

1

6

8

9

10

12

14

16

18

17

19

21

23

22

29

already for identification.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document

2993-D is now received in evidence and retains the

same exhibit number, 2710, and the excerpt therefrom

will receive exhibit No. 2710-A.

(Whereupon, prosecution exhibit No. 2710 for identification and the excerpt therefrom being marked No. 2710-A were received in evidence.)

Q Mr. Witness, you testified about the border line from the solely scientific point of view, did you?

A It would be a mistake to say that I had given it a scholastic study but it was my function, my duty to study the problem.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Up to now you were shown official maps published by the Government General of the Kwantung Province and by the Kwantung Army. Now I will show you a scientific map.

I tender for identification the large map of China and Manchuria drawn up by the Research Scientific Department of the Society of the East Asia Culture, published by the printing office Fuzambo in November, 1932.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The map referred to,

being prosecution document 2993-B, will receive exhibit No. 2711 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 2711 for identification only.)

map be handed to the Court and the original of the map to the witness -- and the original to the witness.

Q Unfold the map, Mr. Witness, and look at the markings on this map. Do you see that it is a big map of China and Manchuria drawn up by Scientific Research Department of East Asia Cultural Society and published by the printing house Fuzambo?

A Yes, I understand.

Q Now find on this map the area of the Buirnor Lake and the Halha River.

A I have found it.

Q You see now that on this map the border line passes east of the Halha River, that is, again in accordance with the contentions of the Soviet and Mongolian side?

A Yes, I see that very well on this map.

Q Then on the maps drawn up and published by the Kwantung Government General and the Kwantung Army in 1911, 1926 and 1934 and on the map drawn up by the

1 2

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

Research Scientific Description Department of East Asia Cultural Society the border line passes to the east of the Halha River, isn't it so?

A It is just as you say according to the maps which have thus far been shown to me by the prosecutor.

1.1

-sa

Kapleau & Wolf

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Q Not according to -- not on one map but on the maps. I have shown to you maps of 1911, 1926 and 1934 and the last map, and on all these maps the borderline passes to the east of the Halha River.

A On the maps which were shown to me since yesterday, it is just as the prosecutor says.

Q Then, you see now that the borderline on the Halha River, as shown on the map published by the Administrative Bureau of the Kwantung Territory in 1935, contradicts the borderline shown on the maps published in 1934, 1926 and 1911 in the same Kwantung Territory, and on the last map published by the Scientific Research Description Department of the East Asia Cultural Society; is that so?

A I know that it differs.

THE PRESIDENT: When are you going to tender finally the map now being looked at by the witness?

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Excuse me, your Honor.

I tender in evidence the map published in 1932 by the Fuzanbo Printing Office and entitled "Large Maps of China and Manchuria" and the copies therefrom.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I object to the reception

19

21 22

23

of the exhibit on the grounds that it is not an official publication and has no probative value.

COLONEL \*MIRNOV: Mr. President, I would like to point out only this; that is, with the help of this witness the defense identified maps taken from some books, the authors of which are unknown and the date of publishing for which is also unknown. I refer to paragraph 4 of the affidavit of this witness where he says precisely "There is a book entitled <a href="Holombair">Holombair</a>" written approximately in 1928 -- I stress the word "approximately" -- by an unknown author in the Chinese language.

In this case I heard him speak about the equality of the rights of prosecution and defense, because I introduced the map published by the Scientific Research Department of the East Asia Culturual Society and the date of publication of this map is known. Maybe the defense would have the right to make such an objection if the defense produced only official maps, but the defense produced the maps the authors of which are unknown and also the date of publication and the place of publishing.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal overrules the objection and admits the document on the usual terms.

4 5

BY COLONEL SMIRNOV (Continued):

Q I would like to deal with some of the evidence given in your affidavit.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The map hasn't been identified.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: I don't quite understand.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document

2993-B is now marked as received in evidence and

will retain the same exhibit number, being 2711,

and the copies or excerpt therefrom will receive

exhibit No. 2711-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to retained the same exhibit number, the excerpt therefrom being marked prosecution's exhibit No. 2711-A and received in evidence.)

Q In paragraph 4 of your affidevit you mention the Chinese book by an unknown author and of unknown date -- unknown date of publishing. If you were going to give arguments concerning the borderline based on the Chinese material, why didn't you refer to the official Chinese publications -- the official Chinese maps?

A since the end of the war we have lost various maps -- various materials.

1 COLONEL SMIRNOV: May the witness be shown exhibit 763?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

COLONEL SMIRNOV: May the copies of the map introduced previously be distributed to the Court? (Whereupon, documents were handed to the Court.)

Q Can you read that it is the official China Postal Album, published by the Postal Establishment in 1919?

A Yes, I understand.

Now, look at the map itself. Do you see that on this map also the borderline passes to the east of the Halha River?

On this map I do see that.

Very well. Now, let us deal with your affidavit again. In paragraph 2 of your affidavit you quote a book written by Japanese Kashiwabara Takahisa and Hamada Jun-ichi and published by the Fuzanbo Publishing House in 1919. I would like to know what precisely are you quoting from the book. Where is the end of the quotation? Is it correct that from this book you quote only one sentence and the sentence is as follows: "In those cases where

2 3

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

there are only plains and no mountains or rivers
which could have served as a border and on valleys
is created for the purpose of marking the borderline."

A I referred to the excerpt just read in
connection with Obo.

Then. the rest of the statement, to the

.crect that between the provinces of Hsingan-Peisheng,
of Manchukuo, and Haluha-miao and Handagaya, of the

Mongolian People's Republic, there is no obo for
the marking of the border, is your own statement,
your invention, isn't it?

 $^{\rm A}$   $^{\rm T}t$  was the result of confirmation on my part.

Then, the last part of the second paragraph is not a quotation from the book but your own opinions and conclusions, isn't it?

A The excerpts from the book are only those portions which referred to the Ching Dynasty.

O Then, you gave the quotation of one sentence from this book only for the purpose of abstract interpretation of the meaning of the Mongolian word "obo." I stress the words only "one sentence."

A No, that is not so. I referred to obo, the symbolic religious structure, as being the markings in places where there were no trees, forests, mountains, or rivers and pasture land.

THE MONITOR: I referred to this question of obe in respect to pasture land where there were no mountains, forests, or rivers to mark any boundaries.

8

6

2

3

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.5

Then, my statement that you gave this quotation only for the abstract interpretation of the Mongolian word 'obd' is correct, isn't it:

A No, that is not so. In other words, where there were no mountains and rivers the rivers were made a boundary, and where there were no rivers the obo was used for this purpose. I referred to this portion to emphasize this point.

O Then, you agree with the statement made by the author of the book "Mongolian Topography" to the effect that obo is the symbolical religious structure of the ancient times which the Mongols used for the marking of the boundaries?

A No, that is not so. There are various kinds of obo, the symbolic religious structures, and each of these cannot be explained in detail in a few words. If I am permitted to do so, I should like to explain briefly about this obo before going further with this discussion.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we have heard enough about this subject matter.

O In this case we shall return to the question of obo later, but I have my last question to you.

Then, you continue to contend that on this sector between Manchuria and Mongolia there were no

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

18

19

21

22

24

obos marking the boundary either in 1938 or 1939 or earlier?

A According to the result of my visit to the

A According to the result of my visit to the spot in 1936 and again in 1938, I can say positively with confidence that I confirm that there were no obo or such symbolic religious structures which could be regarded as serving as a boundary.

- Q Then, you confirm that in the second paragraph of your affidavit?
  - A What portion of paragraph 2 do you mean?
- O I will explain later what I mean. I want to know whether you confirm the end of the second paragraph of your affidavit.

A Will you read that portion?

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, may I pass on to these other questions, because the Language Section hasn't the English test of the affidavit?

 $T^{\mu}\text{E PRESIDENT:}\;\;\text{Yes, we will pass on to}$  something else.

C Do you know that after the border line in the Khalgin-Gol area was changed in 1935 on the Japanese maps the Japanese military officers and the headquarters of the Kwantung Army nevertheless issued for their own use at the headquarters of the Kwantung Army and at the General Staff maps on which the border-

2

4

3

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

15

17

18

20

21

23

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

line was clearly shown as passing east of the Halha River? I shall answer that question. No, I don't know. o In your affidavit you say that in 1938 you carried out special investigations concerning the boundary line in the Halha River area. Apparently you had means and possibilities to study the maps of Mongolia published by the Kwantung Army Headquarters in 1937. Have you the possibilities to use such materials? A I don't remember very well at the present time, but I believe that I did not obtain such reference materials.

Morse & Selze

THE PRESIDENT: Why didn't you consult the maps of the Kwantung Government General before you went out to make an investigation?

THE WITNESS: Before setting out on my survey trip I had already been, in 1936, on the spot for ten months and I did -- it was not necessary for me to refer to a map.

THE PRESIDENT: Oh.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: But you were head of the recognizance department which carried activities vis-a-vis Mongolis -- you were the head of this department in 1938, weren't you?

THE WITNESS: No, that is not true.

THE PRESIDENT: How can you discover the international boundaries without consulting maps unless there are markings of the boundaries on the spot?

THE WITNESS: As I have stated in my affidavit concerning this question, from olden times it had been that where there were -- in pasture lands where there existed a mountain or river, it was customary to regard the river as the boundary.

THE PRESIDENT: But you ignored your own official publications. That is difficult to understand.

THE WITNESS: I shall explain. Before starting out on my survey trip I had been on the spot for

23,710

YANO

25

CROSS

ten months and had fully studied the problem and I had confirmed that fact. THE PRESIDENT: That is more talk. I want you to explain how you could study the problem effectively without consulting maps when you had no markings on the spot? 6 THE WITNESS: I apologize for the lack of 7 clarity in my explanation. In 1936 while I was serving 8 in the Holombair district I had already completed a 9 study of the problem -- a documentary study of this 10 problem. As fer as documents and studying were con-11 12 cerned I had finished studying the problem. 13 THE PARSIDENT: Did the documents include its 14 own official maps, namely, the maps of the Kwantung 15 Government General? 16 THE WITNESS: I did not use such maps which 17 I felt were unreliable. 18 THE PRESIDENT: Did you consult the maps of 19 the Towa Dobunkai organization? 20 THE WITNESS: No, I did not make use of that 21 mep either. 22 THE PRESIDENT: Do you know anything about 23 that organization? 28

THE INTERPRETER: The witness replied that he

did not understand the question very well.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you know anything about that organization - the Towa Dobunkai? THE WITNESS: No, I do not know. 3 BY COLONEL SMIRNOV: (Continued) Now, let us see whether this question about 5 which we speak now was so very clear for TOJO, Hideki 6 and UMEZU, Yoshijiro in 1937 -- was as clear as it was to you? 8 THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Smirnov, you must 9 exercise your own judgment as to whether it is worth 10 while wasting more time on this witness. Do you think 11 12 his quality and his information warrants it? 13 COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, may I be per-14 mitted to produce one more map which the witness 15 should have known and which from my point of view is 16 very important. May the witness be handed exhibit 719? 17 This is the volume of correspondence received by the 18 War Ministry of Japan in 1938 from the Kwantung Army 19 Headquarters. 20 (Whereupon, a document was handed to 21 the witness.) 22 Open the book at the place where the piece 23 of paper is inserted. Have you opened the book? 24 Yes, I have.

Follow me, I shall read the covering letter:

from the topographical department of the Kwantung Army Staff.

"From TOJO, Hideki, Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army.

"To UMEZU, Yoshijiro, Vice Minister of War.

"I herewith submit to you the following item: detailed map of administration of Outer Mongolia."

Follow my reading, you will see the map later.
Read the covering letter. Have I read the covering
letter correctly?

- A Yes, you did.
- Q Do you see the stemp on this covering letter which is "Army Manchuria Secret No. 158"?
  - A Isn't the number 56? Yes, I have found it.
- Q Then is it correct that this map was sent from TOJO, Hideki, the then Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army to UMEZU, Yoshijiro, the then Vice Minister of War?
  - A Yes, I believe it is so.
  - Q Now, let us see the map itself, unfold it.
    THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I should like to point out the document handed to the witness by defense counsel, purporting to be a map from exhibit No. 719, is certified on 22 May 1947. I don't understand what that

1 2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

means but it can't be exhibit 719 if that is the date of it.

THE PRESIDENT: Only the excerpt is certified.

MAR. BLAKENEY: It bears no resemblance to the map itself. If it is an excerpt, it has been considerably altered and I think it should be offered as a separate exhibit. It is going to introduce considerable confusion, I submit, if this excerpt is to be referred to as exhibit 719 and a totally different map introduced also referred to by that number.

THE PRESIDENT: Look into the matter during the recess.

We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

2

3

4

5

6

8

0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Whalen & Dud

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I wish to point out to the Tribunal that the document just handed to defense counsel and presented to the witness and referred to as exhibit 719 is not a document already in evidence. It is a different excerpt from exhibit 719 for identification, which no member of the defense staff, so far as I know, has ever before seen, which was not admitted in evidence so far as I know, and which has only now been handed to us for the first time. That is to say, it is entirely different from exhibit No. 719-A, which was the one admitted in evidence. And I am going to object to the reception in evidence of this excerpt at this time for two reasons: First, non-compliance with the rule of service; and secondly, that the excerpt as presented is misleading. It is a small excerpt from a large map, which large map shows upon inspection that it was compiled by a Russian.

I also wish to submit to the board of language arbiters the question whether the title of the excerpt now newly presented is correctly translated.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, exhibit 719 is a volume of correspondence between the Japanese War

23,715

YANO CROSS

Ministry and the Kwantung Army Headquarters for 1938.

On seeing this book, we can find that it is very large book containing many letters which were filed by the War Ministry in order of their reception from the Kwantung Army. It contains different secret documents which were received by the War Ministry from the Kwantung Army during the whole year of 1938.

The volume as a whole was tendered for identification. Some excerpts from other documents contained in this volume were introduced into evidence earlier. Now I want to offer in evidence the map published in 1937 by the Kwantung Army Headquarters, and the covering letter attached to the map written by TOJO, Hideki, the then Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army, addressed to UMEZU, Yoshijiro, the then Vice-Minister of War. That is all I wanted to do; that is, to introduce in evidence separate excerpts from this volume of correspondence.

Now, as to the question of the Russian author of the map, of whom my colleague spoke. As it is translated by us, the title of the map is as follows: "1937, December, Prepared by the Kwantung Army Staff, original drawn up by Simkov in 1934! Simkov is a Russian name. But I am not interested in the question of nationality of the map expert of the Kwantung Army

()

12

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

Staff who was in the service of the Japanese. I introduce this map for the purpose of proving that it was drawn by the Kwantung -- prepared by the Kwantung Army Staff in 1937 and was published in 1937, and also for the purpose of proving that the border line passed east of the Halha River and that such border line was shown on a secret map of the Kwantung Army Staff even in 1937.

In my submission, it doesn't matter whether this map was drawn or prepared by a Russian, a German, a Chinese or a man of some other nationality. In this case it is important that it is the official secret map of Japanese publication and published by the Kwantung Army Staff.

MR. BLAKENEY: I point out to the Tribunal that as yet there is not a trace of evidence whether the map was published by the Kwantung Army or someone else. The small excerpt now being tendered shows nothing about its origin, by whom it was drafted, or by whom it was published, if it was published. It is for that reason that I am objecting to its reception unless the entire map be tendered so that the Tribunal may see the entire map and draw for itself either these inferences which counsel is drawing or those which we shall later submit should be drawn.

23,717

YANO CROSS

THE PRESIDENT: Undoubtedly we expect the originals now before the witness to be tendered as well; the map and the covering memorandum.

COLONEL SMIRNOV: I can only point out, your Ministry.

Lionor, that in exhibit 719 there is not only one original of the map but eight original copies of the map sent by the Kwantung Army Staff to the War Ministry.

THE PRESIDENT: We want the documents tendered for identification and marked exhibit 719 for that purpose to be tendered as well as the excerpt; that part of exhibit 719 for identification that is relevant, of course.

colonel SMIRNOV: Your Honor, I tendor in evidence the covering memorandum written by TOJO, Hideki, Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army, and addressed to UMEZU, Yoshijiro, the Vice-Minister of War, together with the map attached to the latter which is contained in exhibit 719.

THE PRESIDENT: That document and the preceding document to which objection is raised are admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The original map attached to exhibit 719 is now marked as received in evidence and will be given exhibit No. 719-B, and the excerpts therefrom will receive exhibit No. 719-C.

1 2

4 5

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked prosecution exhibits No. 719-B and No. 719-C respectively, and received in evidence.)

COLONEL SMIRNOV: May the witness be shown again the original of the map so that he could read the inscription on this map?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Lynch, you must give a number to the memorandum also.

CLERK OF THE COURT: The memorandum attached to the excerpt from 719 will receive exhibit No. 719-D.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 719-D and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: I should announce that the accused MUTO and the accused KAYA are, with permission of the Tribunal, conferring with their counsel, and will continue to do so until the end of this session at 12 neon.

Colonel Smirnov.

BY COLONEL SMIRNOV (Continued):

Q Mr. Witness, unfold the map and pay attention to inscriptions and markings on this map. I read the

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

12

13 14

15

16

18

19

21

32

23

25

correct?

title of this map. Follow me. "Detailed Map of Admin-2 istration of Outer Mongolia." Is that correct? Yes. 4 Now, follow my reading the inscription at the left bottom corner of the map, and the legend in the 6 same corner. "1937 December. Prepared by the Kwan-7 tung Army Staff. Drawn up by Simkov in 1934. Scale 1:4,000,000." Have I read the inscription correctly? 9 Not the Kwantung Army Headquarters, but the 10 Kwantung Army General Staff. 11 Then the Kwantung Army Staff is correct? 12 A Yes. 13 Then it is correct that this map was prepared 14 in 1937 in December by the Ewantung Army Staff? 15 This is a map which was copied by the General 16 Staff of the Kwantung Army. 17 I ask you whether it is said on the map that 18 it was prepared by the Kwantung Army Staff? I ask you 10 to read only Japanese inscription. 20 It is written that it was made by the Kwantung 21 Army Headquarters -- General Staff. 22 Then do you see that the border on this map 23

is marked by a broken line, consisting of dashes and

crosses according to the legend of this map; is that

1	A Yes.
2	Q Now, find the Buirnor Lake and the Halha River.
3	A Yes, I found it.
4	Q Then do you see that according to this map
5	also the border line passes east of the Halha River
6	and not on the river itself?
7	A Yes, I do.
8	Q Is that correct?
9	A Yes.
10	THE PRESIDENT: Really we don't want his help
11	to that extent.
12	COLOREL SMIRNOV: Then, your Honor, taking into
13	consideration your remark that there is no need to
14	cross-examine this witness for a long time, I conclude
15	by this my cross-examination.
16	I would like only to draw the Tribunal's atten-
17	tion to the quality of the material presented by the
18	defense attached to the affidavit of this witness.
19	THE PRESIDENT: All I suggest to you is there
20	The state of the s

is no need to ask certain questions.

22

21

23 24

Groonborg & Lofter

10

11

1,2

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COLONIL SMIRNOV: Your Honor, I would like to point out only that between the Japanese version of the defense document 1601-A and the English version of the same document, there is a striking difference which is quite inadmissible. In the English version of this document, the border line passes in accordance with the Soviet-Mongolian contentions, that is, east of the Khalhar River, and in the Japanese version it is impossible to find out how does this border line pass. If I follow the tactics adopted by my learned colleague, I would have crossexamined this witness for three hours on this topic. but, as I only want to save time, I ask my colleague only to clarify and to check this matter for discrepancies, which is probably due to inaccurate copying of the material.

That concludes my cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKFNEY: If I had followed the tactics of my colleague, I should now testify about his map, instead of which, however, I wish to ask leave to reserve my reexamination until such time as we shall have been served with copies and the Tribunal provided with copies of the map, exhibit 719-B.

THE PRESIDENT: You are entitled to a reasonable

time to study that map.

MR. BLAKENEY: I therefore request, if I may, that the witness be stood down until those copies shall have been distributed.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Court would allow you until Monday to consider that new material before you proceed to reexamine the witness.

MR. BLAKENEY: May he be stood down, then?
THE PRESIDENT: The witness is released on
the usual terms until Monday morning next.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I now offer in evidence defense document 1695, a telegram from the charges d'affaires in Moscow to the Secretary of State, dated the 11th of August, 1938, and reporting on the Soviet budget.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Tribunal please,
I object to this document on the ground of its irrelevancy. The contents of this document, in themselves, do not call for a special remark, but I must
say I did not have the opportunity of checking the
correctness of the data given therein. But, introduction of this document by the defense in connection

with this case is biased, and it, so to say, studies the inner life of the Soviet Union from a special point of view. The purpose of the introduction of this document is irrelevant to the issues involved in this case. If the way chosen now by the defense were followed, then files of paper would be heaped up without any use and there would be no progress of the case whatsoever. Therefore, I ask the Tribunal to reject the document.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: The document is relevant as one item showing the increase in Soviet military expenditures and preparedress. I need not again repeat that the issue of the threat of Soviet military might was ever present, as shown by the evidence, in the minds of the Japanese Government, Army, and people. This document relates, of course, to only one particular period of time in connection with Soviet military preparedness. It happened to be all that we had immediately available when other evidence, which we had expected to be able to produce, suddenly proved to be unavailable.

THE PLESIDENT: By a majority, the Court overrules the objection and admits the document.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1695

6

8

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

with this case is biased, and it, so to say, studies the inner life of the Soviet Union from a special point of view. The purpose of the introduction of this document is irrelevant to the issues involved in this case. If the way chosen now by the defense were followed, then files of paper would be heaped up without any use and there would be no progress of the case whatsoever. Therefore, I ask the Tribunal to reject the document.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

one item showing the increase in Soviet military expenditures and preparedress. I need not again repeat that the issue of the threat of Soviet military might was ever present, as shown by the evidence, in the minds of the Japanese Government, Army, and people. This document relates, of course, to only one particular period of time in connection with Soviet military preparedness. It happened to be all that we had immediately available when other evidence, which we had expected to be able to produce, suddenly proved to be unavailable.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Court overrules the objection and admits the document.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1695

will receive exhibit No. 2712.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 2712 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I shall read only excerpts relating to the budget of the Peoples Commissariats for the Army and Navy and Internal Affairs which last is, as shown by exhibit 2681, to maintain military forces in the Far East. I read the first sentence at the beginning:

"According to the published accounts of
the proceedings of the opening joint session of
the Supreme Soviet which took place yesterday evening and which was devoted to the budget, the only
reference to the Far Eastern controversy was made
by the Commissar for Finance Zverev in presenting
the military items of the budget."

I skip now to the third paragraph.

"The principal increases of expenditures uner the State budget not including the local budgets are as follows in compliance last year's State budget.

"(One) The Peoples Commissariats for the Army and Navy by nine thousand 563 million rubles or 54.7 per cent.

1 2

-1

"(Two) The Peoples Commissariats for Internal Affairs by one thousand 325 million rubles or 54.2 per cent."

And from there, I skip to the last paragraph.

"Zverev emphasized the fact that exceptional increases of expenditures for defence purposes are being made by the capitalist countries particularly by the 'Fascist states' and in pointing out that Soviet policy is directed 'not only toward the defence of the Soviet land but also of the workers of all countries' declares that the increased appropriations for Soviet defence will still further strengthen the power of the mother land so that 'woe will be to him who endeavors to test the strength of Soviet arms.'"

With the exception of such matters as have been reserved, that concludes my presentation, and I now yield to Mr. Cunningham who will present additional evidence relating to the foregoing part of the Russian phase.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Tribunal please, I have some additional documents concerning the Anti-Comintern Pact, which were not processed in time to present them to the Tribunal before the end of the

evidence in that matter.

I now offer in evidence defense document 1316, excerpt taken from interrogation of J. von Ribbentrop on 20 September 1945 at Neurnberg. The interrogator is Colonel Brundage, U. S. Army. In this interrogation von Ribbentrop explains that the Anti-Comintern Pact was an ideological pact directed against communism, that Germany tried to get Great Britain to join, and that Germany considered the improvement of relations with Great Britain and France as far more important than the establishment of a friendly relation with Japan. This is taken from a copy of the interrogation. The original is not available, being on file in Neurnberg.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If it pleases the Tribunal, we object to this document. A very minor
but not unimportant objection to it is that all the
key words, which would make it intelligible, are in
German, a language which not all of us understand.
No doubt, at Neurnberg, certain German words became
familiar currency in the course of the investigation,
just as here certain Japanese words have.

THE PRESIDENT: If Ribbentrop conversed in English but occasionally used a German term, we must

1 2

have the German term.

MR. COMYNS CARR: On page 1, there is frequent reference to the word "eltanschuungs," the precise meaning of which is unknown to me, and on page 3, there is reference to something called the "Reppolo policy" in the middle, and also frequent references to the word "Weltauffassungen". Those words frequently occur in the document, and unless one knows what they mean, the whole thing is unintelligible.

THE PRESIDENT: We must be sure they are correctly spelled in German. But, did Ribbentrop converse in German or English? If he conversed in German, we should have a complete translation in English.

MR. COMYNS CARR: I am informed that he conversed in German, and this is an imperfect translation into English.

But, your Honor, my much more important objection is that Ribbentrop's views in September, 1945, as to what had been German intentions in 1936 in entering into a treaty, which speaks for itself, are irrelevant and obviously self-serving.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Honor please, I

wish to assure the Tribunal that Ribbentrop spoke perfect English and that in all my conferences with him, he never used by one German word, and that was this one, because there was no English equivalent.

THE PRESIDENT: Was this particular conference or interrogation in English or in German?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The interrogation is there in its full context, and I will assure you that it was in English because I am sure that neither Smith Brookhart nor Colonel Brundage understood German.

I am satisfied there there was no interpreter there and no need for one.

On the second proposition, the prosecutor says the document speaks for itself, the Anti-Comintern Pact which this evidence bears upon. If that is so, then that proves our case, because it is the contention, as I understood it, of the prosecution that this pact meant something that it did not say. That was, at least, the language I understood when the Court asked the prosecutor for his interpretation of what he expected to prove under the Anti-Comintern issue.

THE PRESIDENT: Let us keep to the first issue. Was this document tendered at the Neurnberg trial?

. 23

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The Anti-Comintern Pact and its context was not a matter of issue at the Neurnberg trial, and this is a preliminary investigation into the Anti-Comintern Pact, one of various investigations which formed the basis upon which they formed the issues in the Neurnberg trial.

THE PRESIDENT: It appears from the affidavit of John Amen, who is an officer of the United States Army, that the interrogation was conducted in English, and the interrogation was on oath.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That is all I have to say, your Honor, except that the Language Section can very easily give you an interpretation of the word which means "idealogy" and "ideological," if you want a literal interpretation of it.

THE PRESIDENT: Our Language Section does not contain any Germans or persons with a knowledge of German, as far as I am aware.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Nor am I prepared to accept my friend's translation.

THE PRESIDENT: Judges are not allowed to translate these things themselves no matter how expert in the language. They must have evidence.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in reply to one other remark of my friend, where he said that

4 5

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The Anti-Comintern Pact and its context was not a matter of issue at the Neurnberg trial, and this is a preliminary investigation into the Anti-Comintern Pact, one of various investigations which formed the basis upon which they formed the issues in the Neurnberg trial.

THE PRESIDENT: It appears from the affidavit of John Amen, who is an officer of the United States Army, that the interrogation was conducted in English, and the interrogation was on oath.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: That is all I have to say, your Honor, except that the Language Section can very easily give you an interpretation of the word which means "idealogy" and "ideological," if you want a literal interpretation of it.

THE PRESIDENT: Our Language Section does not contain any Germans or persons with a knowledge of German, as far as I am aware.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Nor am I prepared to accept my friend's translation.

THE PRESIDENT: Judges are not allowed to translate these things themselves no matter how expert in the language. They must have evidence.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in reply to one other remark of my friend, where he said that

the pact portended something more than it says, quite true. From the point of view of the Japanese it is material to know what the Japanese intentions were by such evidence as can be presented.

THE PRESIDENT: It is twelve now. We'll hear you after adjournment. We will adjourn until half-past one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

6

8

9

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

## AFTERNOON SESSION

2 The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330, 3

Hon. R. B. Pal, Member from the Government of India, not sitting.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I had almost 10 finished. I was just submitting that whereas evidence as to what was in the mind of the Japanese with respect to the Anti-Comintern Pact is relevant and material and may be proved from German as well as Japanese sources, evidence as to what was in Ribbentrop's mind is irrelevant even if it were contemporary and not made in an interrogation after the event and even if it were intelligible, which it is not.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Honor please, in spite of the fact that that is Mr. Carr's second argument on this objection that he has made, I want to say that over my most strenuous objections last fall these documents which eminated from Germany expressing the thought of the German leaders concerning the questions involved in this

case were admitted. This document is introduced for the purpose of explaining and showing the background of those documents which have been the basis of establishing the Japanese-German relations in this Tribunal. I believe it is relevant, highly material, and I believe after listening you will find it very significant.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Then I move to strike from the record all the documents which eminated from J. Von Ribbentrop in Germany which form a basis of the German-Japanese relations in this trial, a list of the exhibits to be tendered at a subsequent date.

THE PRESIDENT: This may be a mere expression of resentment, Mr. Cunningham; I do not know. But there should be a notice of such a motion. Another Member of the Court expresses his reaction in much stronger terms.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, such things do not deter me. I remember distinctly that I made the same objections which Mr. Carr made to these documents when they were being introduced, and as usual --

6

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

21

20

22

25

23

Tribunal is constituted from time to time. We have ten Members this afternoon. If we had eleven the result may have been different. Tomorrow, or Monday, or some other sitting day we may have nine, and we may have a different result. You must take the verdict of the majority. As an experienced counsel you must be accustomed to getting adverse decisions.

THE RESIDENT: It depends on how the

Mt. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honor, this experience alone has schooled me in that.

I was only half way through my motion when the Hight went on.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we will not receive your motion this afternoon, Mr. Cunningham. Just think it over.

IR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer in evidence defense document 613-A(11), which is an excerpt from the interrogation of MATSUOKA, Yosuke, at Sugamo Prison on the 12th of March, 1946, in which MATSUOKA emphasized the efforts made by Japan to prevent in Asia the spread of communism.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, as far as I am awave, the prosecution did not introduce in

 evidence any part of the interrogation of MATSUOKA, and in my submission, that being so, it cannot be introduced by the defense. At all events its introduction is not covered by any ruling given by the Tribunal up to the present time. That is the only objection we have to this document, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: According to the strict rules of evidence it would not be admissible, but they may or may not be applied.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Might I suggest that the matter of relevance and probative value seem to have been the test for evidence in the past, and I suggest that this material that MATSUOKA says would be relevant, and it certainly would have probative value -- one of the men in the Cabinet. I suggest that your Honors well know that MATSUOKA was one of the defendants and what he says would have some bearing definitely on the relations of the other defendants.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is upheld, and the document rejected.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer in evidence defense document 1400-T(2), an excerpt from Foreign Relations of the United States, Japan 1931-1941, Vol. II, page 2-3, which is a telegram sent by Ambassador Grew from Tokyo on 18 May 1939 to the Secretary of State in Washington, concerning his conversation with Foreign Minister ARITA.

ARITA explained to Ambassador Grew that Japan did not join into the camp of totalitarian nations in opposition to the democratic nations, and Grew

found that no substantial opposition in the Japanese Government to this view of ARITA's did exist.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, in my submission, it is not proper for a running commentary to state the contents of a document before it has been admitted.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no objection to a brief statement of the purpose of the admission of the document. Such statements were indulged in freely by the prosecution.

IMR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, the document consists of two paragraphs. The first is a quotation from a statement by a person not named. The second is an expression of Mr. Grew's opinion as to the truth of another statement made by ARITA and as to the prospects of stability of the then Japanese

Cabinet. In our submission neither carries the case any further.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I agree, your Honor, that perhaps Mr. Carr and I could take the time and explain this document in our argument, but I should think it would be better to receive the statement of what Mr. Grew said, and this book has been the source of a great deal of the prosecution's evidence one way or other, and I think we ought to have the right to take excerpts from it to prove our side of the case. It seems only reasonable.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is upheld except as to the first sentence in the second paragraph.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We withdraw the document.

I now offer defense document 502, excerpt No. 9, which is a paragraph from Robert Craigie's book. We only wish to show by this document that Germany was not cooperating with Japan even though they had an anti-comintern pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, this document has already been tendered and rejected by the Tribunal at page 20,516 of the

1 2

record, and I ask that it be treated in the same way when it is tendered a second time.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I submit that the document suggests what I have stated, and I ask that it be received in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: I have received no intimation that the ruling should be changed from any of my colleagues. The objection is upheld, and the document again rejected.

IR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer in evidence document 1626, an excerpt from the Japan Year Book 1941-1942, pages 188 to 191, which contains, among other things, the statement of the Japanese Foreign Office on the 25th of November, 1936, and on the 6th of November, 1937, concerning the conclusion of the Anti-Comintern Pact between Japan and Germany and the Tri-Partite Agreement against the comintern between Japan, Germany, and Italy, respectively.

The purpose of tendering this evidence is to show that the menace of the comintern activities all over the world, especially in China and Japan, compelled Japan to enter into this agreement first with Germany and then with Italy,

record, and I ask that it be treated in the same way when it is tendered a second time.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

AR. CUNNINGHAM: I submit that the document suggests what I have stated, and I ask that it be received in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: I have received no intimation that the ruling should be changed from any of my colleagues. The objection is upheld, and the document again rejected.

IR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer in evidence document 1626, an excerpt from the Japan Year Book 1941-1942, pages 188 to 191, which contains, among other things, the statement of the Japanese Foreign Office on the 25th of November, 1936, and on the 6th of November, 1937, concerning the conclusion of the Anti-Comintern Pact between Japan and Germany and the Tri-Partite Agreement against the comintern between Japan, Germany, and Italy, respectively.

The purpose of tendering this evidence is to show that the menace of the comintern activities all over the world, especially in China and Japan, compelled Japan to enter into this agreement first with Germany and then with Italy,

-

Manchukuo, Hungary, and Spain. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr. 3 MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to this document, which is a long argumentative, narrative account 6 of matters leading up to the Anti-Comintern Pact and the adhesion of Italy, Manchukuo, and Hungary 8 to it. As to the Foreign Office statements said to be contained in it, if those are material, in 10 my submission they should be proved in the ordinary 11 way, separately, without all this comment. 12 13 1.1 15 16 17 18 19 21 22

20

23

24

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Your Honors, this is one document which we didn't believe the prosecution would object to, for the reason that over our objection a vast amount of material in this case has been introduced against the defendants from this very source.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer defense document 1611, which is the constitution and rules of
the Communist Internationale. No one can understand
the real significance of the Anti-Comintern Pact and
the vital necessity at the time for such an agreement without having first an understanding of the
organization, purposes, and program for world revolution of the Communist Party.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution objects to this document for two reasons. The first, a minor reason, is that the certificate is improper and misleading. It says that the document is an official document of the Japanese Foreign Office. It obviously is not. It is a piece of paper obtained by the Japanese Foreign Office from some source, unnamed, which the Japanese

16

18

19

20

21

9

10:

11

12

13

Foreign Office choses to keep in its archives. It may be, and there have been occasions when it has been, relevant to prove the fact that the Japanese Foreign Office chose to preserve some document not its own amongst its archives. That fact may amount to something in the nature of an admission.

The major objection is that the rules of the Communist Internationale are irrelevant for any purpose of this inquiry. It deals in considerable detail with the organization and voting rights of various parties in this body. There is only one paragraph, the first, which purports to set out its objects, which, in our submission, are also immateral al for the purpose of this inquiry.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: In answer to the first 16 objection, I would say that the only question is 17 whether or not this is or is not the constitution 18 and rules of the Communist Internationale, and cer19 tainly there is no question about that.

On the second proposition, if any one of the democratic nations could read this document without blushing at the world-wide program of the 23Communist Party, then I would withdraw the document 24without even presenting it.

25

THE PRESIDENT: That is a test that can never

be applied, in the nature of things.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the question in this case is whether or not the Japanese leaders were justified in executing the Anti-Comintern Pact, this document is the answer.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Tribunal upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now present defense document 1530, which emphasizes that the 7th Congress of Comintern, in 1935, advocated the following:

- "1. Establishment of a united front on an international scale.
  - "2. It advocated revolutionary tactics.
- "3. It seeks to promote economic and political penetration into wider horizons.
- "4. It suggests at 'D', at page 3, 'International Communist Novements', this should permit a resistance movement as contemplated in the Anti-Comintern Pact.

"These are the facts which we propose to prove by this revealing document, and this, in my judgment, is the cause of the effect, the cause being the resolution of the 7th International Congress and the effect being the Anti-Comintern Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

1

3

\*2

6

7

8

1.0

11

12

13

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

be applied, in the nature of things.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the question in this case is whether or not the Japanese leaders were justified in executing the Anti-Comintern Pact, this document is the answer.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Tribunal upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now present defense document 1530, which emphasizes that the 7th Congress of Comintern, in 1935, advocated the following:

- "1. Establishment of a united front on an international scale.
  - "2. It advocated revolutionary tactics.
- "3. It seeks to promote economic and political penetration into wider horizons.
- "4. It suggests at 'D', at page 3, 'International Communist Novements', this should permit a
  resistance movement as contemplated in the Anti-Comintern Pact.

"These are the facts which we propose to prove by this revealing document, and this, in my judgment, is the cause of the effect, the cause being the resolution of the 7th International Congress and the effect being the Anti-Comintern Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

20

d

.

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

be applied, in the nature of things.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the question in this case is whether or not the Japanese leaders were justified in executing the Anti-Comintern Pact, this document is the answer.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Tribunal upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now present defense document 1530, which emphasizes that the 7th Congress of Comintern, in 1935, advocated the following:

- "1. Establishment of a united front on an international scale.
  - "2. It advocated revolutionary tactics.
- "3. It seeks to promote economic and political penetration into wider horizons.
- "4. It suggests at 'D', at page 3, 'International Communist Movements', this should permit a resistance movement as contemplated in the Anti-Comintern Pact.

"These are the facts which we propose to prove by this revealing document, and this, in my judgment, is the cause of the effect, the cause being the resolution of the 7th International Congress and the effect being the Anti-Comintern Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

25

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Wonor, we object to this document.

In the first place, it has no certificate at all and no means of identifying its origin -- that was served upon us, at all events. But the major objection is irrelevance.

It offends against the ruling of the Tribunal, already given, with regard to similar documents
dealing with communist or any other ideology. There
is no reference anywhere to Japan, nor any suggestion of making war upon anybody. On the contrary, it
appears to be an appeal against the danger of outbreak of war due to German fascism, which is the
subject matter of paragraph 6, on page 5, the rest
being merely a call to communist parties to strengthen
their political position.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I suggest that this is a preliminary of three documents, which definitely shows that the comintern set out to cause world revolution, and is one of the three; and we will later show by our evidence that that actually took place in certain parts of the world and in spite of the Anti-Comintern Pact. These documents, all three, should be read together -- 1530, 1531, and 1532. If this evidence is irrelevant and immaterial, I

should like to have a direct on from the Tribunal as to what it considers evidence material and relevant to meet this issue of the Anti-Comintern Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Like every other court we will wait until the evidence is tendered and then will say whether it is admissible or not.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, your Honor, in response to that: As I understood in the prosecution's case the Court accepted the evidence with the understanding that at the end of the case they will consider all the evidence and determine then whether or not it had any probative value; and that is the real test.

THE PRESIDENT: That is not correct, as the Court frequently rejected evidence tendered by the prosecution.

A Member of the Court would like to know whether you have any authentication of this particular document, Mr. Cunningham?

MR. CUNNINGHAM: 1531 is a book from which all three of these documents were taken.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court upholds the objection and rejects the document.

IM. CUNNINGHAM: Defense document 1532 is another resolution adopted by the 7th World Congress of the Communist International. Although this document contains some harmful statements to the cause of the defense, it also offers some justification

for the agreement between nations to curtail the spread of communism. It gives both sides of the picture which the Tribunal must judge sooner or later. In its final analysis I believe the document has probative value and makes very interesting observations. It offers cause for democracies to stop and think today as it aroused the nations named at the time.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

I offer defense document 1532.

IR. COMYNS CARR: If it please the Tribunal, my friend's last remark reveals the real purpose of the introduction of these documents; namely, to take part in a propaganda issue at the present day.

All the objections which I took to the last document apply to it, except that there are two paragraphs in which there is reference to Japan. They are the second paragraph on page one and the last paragraph on page six. In each case they contain an appeal to resist Japanese aggression in Manchuria and China, which, in our submission, as we made before, could afford no possible justification for further aggression.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, I presumed that those two references would attract the attention of the prosecutor and he would have no objection to them,

but I am interested in the admission of the parts of the document which are favorable to the defense and which gives the Court both sides.

If the learned prosecutor feels that the information which the nations of today are putting out against the spread of communism is pure progaganda, then I should like to know what his definition of propaganda is because I consider it a very real project. And, as an American, I take the absolute opposite view to his British view.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not know him to express any British, American, or any other view.

By a majority the Court upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer defense document 1533, which is one of the resolutions of the 7th Convention of the Comintern. One of the forerunners of the Anti-Comintern Pact it shows; one, that the communists were pledged to carry out a program of deportation of capitalistic elements and the extermination of rich farmers as a class; two, offenses which are considered crimes against humanity under the Charter of this Tribunal. I refer to Article V, Section C. This in itself is sufficient reason for the Anti-Comintern Fact if read in the light of

world events. It shows specifically that world revolution was planned.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: If it please your Honor, this document is subject to all the same objections as the first one. There is no reference to Japan in particular in it. It deals almost entirely with internal affairs in the USSR and puts forward a picture and claim to the success of the government of that country in carrying out its objects.

In addition, it points to the danger of a world war being instituted by Fascist Governments, and makes an appeal to its readers for such a thing to be prevented.

Again, there is no certificate.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I submit, that this document bears all the earmarks that I gave it and I think that if read in the light of the Anti-Comintern Pact, that it certainly justifies the action taken in that document.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now present defense document 1531 which is one of the resolutions of the 7th Convention of the Comintern, shows on its first page

15

1

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

18

19

21

22

2.1

that it proposes a world wide program toward the spread of communism. This resolution fosters class prejudice which in itself is undemocratic and contrary to good government as we know it. It advocates anti-imperialism which struck directly at Japan. 

S G

S 6

å

z 7

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The prosecution objects to this document for the same reasons as before. To this there is a certificate which in our submission is misleading for the same reasons that I gave with regard to the last document that had a certificate. It is propaganda against Facism and against the dangers of a world war likely to be started by Faccist governments. The only reference I can see to Japan is the first paragraph on page 13 which, like the previous document which contained a reference to Japan, is an appeal to resist Japanese Imperialism, in China.

MR. CUNAINGHAM: I submit that the argument of counsel for the prosecution has increased the relevancy of this document in that it shows that both powers, the Fascists and Communists, were preparing their claims, both claiming them defensive measures and that the Anti Comintern Pact was a defense against the Communist party. The Seventh International Congress taking place in 1935 set up its program and the Anti Comintern Pact executed in 1936 was a defense against that, getting right back to the proposition of cause and effect.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court

В

4 5

upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: The next document -- I would like to have you send out and get 1571 so we can get it in a few minutes if you have it in your office.

You didn't distribute it?

THE PAISIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

was in Mr. Blakeney's order of proof but it was withdrawn because the stipulation had been entered into
but he referred to the document perhaps for a different reson than I did. I'll pass it for a few minutes.
They have sent out for the copies and it will be
here in a few minutes.

I now offer in evidence defense document 1409. We do so with the specific purpose of showing that the strength of the communists in China was the Communist Army, just as today. We can see without looking too far about us the effect of a revolutionary military force upon the soverieghty of a nation. Must we show that it happened in Japan before it becomes a threat to the peace of this Nation? We think not. This document enforces our theory that the existence of a communist army in China actually threatened the very existence of Japan and justified a defensive agreement to prevent its spread.

This document should be admitted. It springs from the Cabinet Information Board of the Japanese Government.

THE PRISIDINT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, with regard to document 1409, it is a long argumentative report by the Cabinet Information Board, full of opinion. It purports to bear the date July 24, 1936 but that is obviously incorrect because it refers to matters up to 1939. There is no statement indicating the source of the assertions which it contains and it is peppered with phrases such as "we cannot imagine" and "it is said. In our submission the document has no probative

value and, for the reasons already so many times submitted, if it had the subject matter is irrelevant.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I refer the Tribunal especially to page 5 and on page 7 which seem to be the crux of the advice given the cabinet by the Cabinet Information Board. There may be a mistake on the date; it may be '39 instead of '36 but that will be corrected. But I submit that the cabinet could not make decisions without some information. This Cabinet Information Board seems to be the source of a great deal of information upon which the Japanese cabinet based its decision.

I am advised that the orginal Japanese document reads 1939.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the Court upholds the objection and rejects the document.

I think this is a convenient time to recess, Mr. Cunningham. We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500 after which the proceedings were resumed as follows, Lord Patrick, Member from the United Kingdom of Great Britain, not sitting:)

1.2

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: With the permission of the Tribunal, the accused TOGO will be absent for the balance of the session, conferring with his counsel.

Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now go to 1571, which was on Mr. Blakeney's order of proof, but I only intended to refer to it in my order of proof; but he withdrew it and therefore I offer the document for the purpose of showing that the Anti-Comintern Pact and the Secret Agreement were legal international agreements, and to show that the agreements annexed to the pact were abrogate also in accordance with international law and custom; and since no evidence has been introduced to show that Japan and Germany performed any illegal acts pursuant to these agreements, we propose that their effect must be considered null and void.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal. THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: The document proves nothing whatever except the agreed fact that when the Anti-Comintern Pact was renewed in November 1941, the Secret Agreement was not renewed with it.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney, I understand,

withdrew it because it proved nothing beyond that.

MR. COMYNS CARR: And that fact was agreed.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, if the prosecution agrees that nothing was done under these agreements, there is no reason why we should offer it.

MR. COMYNS CARR: That is not what we agreed, nor does the document have any bearing on that question. All that the document refers to, and all that we agreed, was the fact that the Secret Protocol was not renewed.

THE PRESIDENT: I think I should reject it as surplusage on behalf of the Tribunal. It is rejected accordingly.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We now offer defense document 1541, which is an official press release of the United States Department of State, corroborating and explaining publicly the official United States protest to the Soviet Union, as described in defense document 1543. This document expresses virtually in its way what the Anti-Comintern Pact expresses another way. We contend that either method is a legal exercise of a sovereign right of a nation or nations when they feel their national security threatened by an outside force. Diplomacy is the first step in the solution of such problems.

1 2

withdrew it because it proved nothing beyond that.

MR. COMYNS CARR: And that fact was agreed.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, if the prosecution agrees that nothing was done under these agreements, there is no reason why we should offer it.

MR. COMYNS CARR: That is not what we agreed, nor does the document have any bearing on that question. All that the document refers to, and all that we agreed, was the fact that the Secret Protocol was not renewed.

THE PRESIDENT: I think I should reject it as surplusage on behalf of the Tribunal. It is rejected accordingly.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: We now offer defense document 1541, which is an official press release of the United States Department of State, corroborating and explaining publicly the official United States protest to the Soviet Union, as described in defense document 1543. This document expresses virtually in its way what the Anti-Comintern Pact expresses another way. We contend that either method is a legal exercise of a sovereign right of a nation or nations when they feel their national security threatened by an outside force. Diplomacy is the first step in the solution of such problems.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I have before me two documents, each numbered exhibit 2713. The first is a copy of an affidavit by one Amen which I found on my table on my return to the court this afternoon.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, prosecution objects to this document as wholly irrelevant. What action the United States thought fit to take, based, as a matter of fact, upon a special agreement which they had with the U.S.S.R. is, we submit, quite immaterial.

Might I remind the Tribunal that some weeks ago at the request of the Tribunal, I endeavored to clarify the position of the prosecution with regard to this Anti-Comintern Pact, pointing out that we alleged no objection to Japan or any other country taking any steps it thought proper to prevent the spread of communism or any other ideology within its own borders, and that we only relied upon that pact in so far as it was used as an excuse for armed intervention in the affairs of other countries and led up to military aggression in alliance with Germany and Italy.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Honors please, I have before me page 22,451, which Mr. Carr said at that time, and I see no similarity between the two

contentions. I should merely refer the Tribunal to have it read those pages and determine for itself just what the prosecution is now claiming for the Anti-Comintern Pact, because it seems the position has changed.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Court upholds the objection and rejects the document.

1

2

B

5

7

8

10

11

12

. 13

14

15

17

19

23

24

25

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Defense document 1542 is offered to show that the resolutions of the 7th International All-World Congress was in violation of the pledge of Soviet Russia to the United States of November 16, 1933, as well as a menace to the national security of Japan.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: In our submission, your Honor, this document is precisely the same as the last one in effect, and is covered by the ruling of the Tribunal. We object to it for the same reason.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I submit that Japan had exactly the same right to make an anti-comintern pact as the United States had to make a formal protest to Soviet Russia against the activities of the 7th International Comintern Convention, and they exercised that right.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Court

1-	
	upholds the objection and rejects the document.
-	

MA. CUNNINGHAM: Defense document 1543 is now offered to show that other nations, particularly the United States, became especially concerned about the activity of the 7th Congress. The United States being one of the strongest nations in the world could accomplish by protest what Germany and Japan chose to effect by an international agreement. This document shows the firm attitude of the United States and the accompanying documents show: the reaction of the Soviet Regime to the protest. Other evidence to be introduced later will show the Soviet reaction to the Anti-Comintern Pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MI. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, this document is open to exactly the same objections as the last two. Actually it doesn't show what my friend alleges; it is simply the Soviet reply to the previous document, giving their reasons, good or bad, for the rejection of the United States protest, and is, in our submission, entirely irrelevant.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I submit that this document shows that the United States was protesting in that day in their way exactly as they are protesting today in another way.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the Court upholds

the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer in evidence defense document 1669, which is by now historical document in which it is shown that the threat of the spread of communism in Europe became a reality. What the venerable, great statesman, Mr. Churchill, says on this highly controversial subject certainly has probative value.

charges with up-to-date proof. As the Indictment in this case was being drawn in March 1946, the address, of which this excerpt is a part, was being delivered at Fulton, Missouri, in the United States. The explanation meets the charge as it relates to Germany as well as Japan. By this statement we expect to prove that the desire to prevent the spread of communism through the Anti-Comintern Pact was a wholesome agreement. Only the part of the address which is material to this issue has been excerpted.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: May it please the Tribunal, it is not easy to deal patiently with the offering of this document.

THE PRESIDENT: The patience I am displaying is not shared by all of my colleagues, I can assure you,

20.7

Mr. Carr. But better be patient than otherwise.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Much as I respect Mr. Winston Churchill, in our submission his opinions in March 1946 about the state of world affairs at that time can have no bearing of any sort, kind or description on the issues before this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Cunningham.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I think a reading of the biography of Mr. Churchill from the World War days will show that immediately after World War I he was as rabid as anyone on the anti-Soviet problem. He changed his view and went anti-Nazi in 1933. And in 1945 or 1946 again he changes his view. As a leader of Great Brit: in we are entitled to show what the attitude towards communism was by this great statesman, and how even his attitude changed over a period of years.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, I really must protest against this kind of harangue being permitted before this Tribunal.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I respect the protest, but
I am not deterred thereby. But I feel that it is
essential to press every possible defense which we
have, and I believe that the opinion of a great statesman, one of our leaders of today and of yesterday, certainly is pertinent to this question which is so prevalent

today, and was in 1936.

This document is not only offered as evidence in this case specifically, but for the readers of this case in history when this case may go down, and it ought to be a part of the record in this case.

THE PRESIDENT: As a member of a great bar you know you are not at liberty to press for the admission of a document on that ground in this case.

The Tribunal, by a majority, upholds the objection and rejects the document.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: In order to save hours, perhaps days of time in showing to what extent the leaders of communism were extending their activities into the Japanese and German channels, we offer a brief report of one of the greatest spy cases in history.

This document, 1317, which we now offer, discloses that Sorge, one of the cleverest of Russian spies and espionage agents, invaded the German Embassy in Tokyo, destroyed the ambassadorial career of the then German ambassador, and caused an international incident.

It is impossible to evaluate the vast amount of documentary evidence introduced by the prosecution which originated with Ambassador Ott without having some understanding of the situation which existed within the German Embassy during his tour of duty, especially

since it will be shown that he was clearing his information through the medium of a very clever Russian spy.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: Your Honor, those observations are founded upon a piece of newspaper gossip, the document now tendered being an extract from the Nippon Times of October 24, 1945. Even if the source of the information had probative value, which numerous rulings of the Tribunal have shown that it has not, in our submission the question whether a German newspaper correspondent who had some contact with the German ambassador in Tokyo was or was not a spy would be wholly irrelevant to this case.

Curiously enough the next document on my friend's list by another journalist presents exactly an opposite view of the nature and character of this individual Sorge.

In our submission neither document has any probative value, nor has the subject any relevance.

1

4

5

6

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If your Henors please, the 2 burned German Embassy on the road to the War Ministry bears evidence that the confidential documents upon which this case is based are not available, and the other documents which verify these facts are not readily available to us. But, last evening, I obtained an affidavit which is very, very short and which verifies that the report by one of the associates of Sorge, which should be read into the record. If there is any question of the authenticity, it could take a week or a month to bring in the official records of the trial of this case. But I merely want to call it to the attention of the court as a matter pertinent to the evaluation of the documentary evidense which emanated from the German Embassy over the pen of Eugene Ott.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal upholds the objection and rejects the document.

I'R. CUNNINGHAM: I, then, merely make formal offer of the next document, 1698G.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. COMYNS CARR: And I formally object for the same reason as the last one.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is upheld and the document rejected.

8

10

11,

13

14 15

16

17

18,

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I now offer to read parts of an excerpt from the diary of Joseph E. Davies, former Ambassador from the United States to Soviet Russia. The diary "Mission to Moscow" is offered for identification, and the excerpts therefrom are offered into evidence. Being a diary and specifically mentioned as acceptable evidence in the Charter, and being recorded by an Ambassador to the government in question, the evidence is both material and relevant. To save time and documentation, several excerpts are included in the same document.

I shall read only the first four sentences of the first excerpt. The excerpts should be considered separately as they pertain to different subjects, that is, if there is going to be objection which, apparently, there is. I should like to go through the list of excerpts, as the Court observes them, and make my brief submission as to what each excerpt we believe proves to us.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Comyns Carr.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: I wasn't quite through, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: You will be able to reply to him fully.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: But I haven't completed my

7 8

'21

offer, your Honor, of the document. I wonder if I could complete that before I hear the objection to it.

THE PRESIDENT: We know, of course, Mr. Cunningham, that your purpose is not to explain the reasons for tendering these documents but to get into the record as much as you can of documents which you think may be rejected.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Under the practice adopted here I believe it is within my right to suggest what I believe the document will do for me, and I ask that the Court accept the explanation of what these execepts are expected to prove.

THE PRESIDENT: Let us have your explanation.

7 8

MR. CUMNINGHAM: The second excerpt shows that Russia was furnishing aid to China although acting friendly to Japan.

The third excerpt shows that Russia was fast preparing for war with some unnamed nation of the Far East.

The fourth excerpt throws light upon the weak link binding Germany and Italy.

The fifth shows that Litvinoff did not anticipate any aggressive action by Japan against the Soviet Union as of March 17, 1938.

The sixth excerpt gives an insight into the undemocratic manner in which the Soviet foreign relations were conducted and of the Soviet leader.

The seventh says, I quote: "Any aggression against the Soviet Union by Japan is out of the question." (March 29, 1938) Coming from Litvinov, this is relevant and of some value.

Excerpt eight of the excerpts in 1447 is valuable on account of its last sentence, which indicates that Russia was planning action against Japan some day.

The ninth excerpt is quite revealing since it corroborates the testimony given during the past few days and is relevant to the issues covered.

Excerpt ten shows that Russia would have done the same thing Japan did if the situation were reversed.

The twelfth excerpt concerns Japanese protest against Russia's breach of neutrality on the China question.

The thirteenth excerpt is opinion not borne out according to recent propaganda. At least, there are two schools of thought.

The fourteenth excerpt confirms our contention that the Comintern is a military and strategic project, as well as ideological.

Fifteen is skipped.

The sixteenth excerpt goes to the journal of 4 June 1938, excerpt 16. A glance at this excerpt will convince anyone that it bears on exactly what we have been touching upon for this last week.

The seventeenth excerpt explains something which has been a matter of suspicion for a long time but seldom said except by those possessed of special information as Mr. Davies.

The eighteenth excerpt: No. 5 and No. 7 may be helpful to the Tribunal in understanding what we have been striving to establish during these past three weeks.

1 2

3

5

7

9

8

10

11

15

16

16

17

19 20

21

23

Let us now refer to the last excerpt, page 410, entitled "Russia-Finland." The third sentence rings one of the bells of our contentions. 

THE PRESIDENT; Mr. Comyns Carr.

B

MR. COMYNS CARR: In our submission, your Henor, this document should be rejected in its entirety. The book from which the excerpts are taken is not, in the ordinary sense of the word, a diary at all as is shown by the fact that, out of twenty-two extracts on this document, eight of them bear no date whatever and some of them are described as being extracted from a summary. They are full of opinion, as one would expect from such a book, and, in our submission, almost the whole of it is irrelevent.

I do not know exactly to which particular paragraphs my friend was referring by numbers because the copy served upon us is not numbered, but I presume I should deal with them one by one as my friend has done.

On page 1, the first, with an illegible date, is utterly trivail and irrelevant in our submission. It merely relates a friendly dinner party with SAITO, who was, apparently, at the time Japanese Ambassador in Washington, and the Russiam Ambassador in Washington before Mr. Davies sailed for Moscow, and discusses the foundation of some kind of international golf club.

The second on page 1 merely states that the Seviet has no intention of intervening in a military way in the Japan-China War but would, as she was perfectly entitled to do and as other peace-loving countries were doing for similar reasons, aid China without indulging in war or breaking diplomatic relations with Japan.

The third on page 1 merely records Mr.

Davies' opinion, from various circumstances observed

by him, that the Soviet Union, as well she might, was
apprehensive of the breaking out of a fascist world

war and was taking such steps as she could to meet

it. That was in March, 1938.

On page 2, the first extract, undated, shows that Litvinov foresaw a fascist peace imposed by Germany and Italy and makes the very sensible prophecy that Italy would have cause to repent having entered into alliance with Germany.

The second one on page 2, undated, states that some unnamed person said that Japan had approximately a million men in China, including three hundred thousand in Manchukuo.

The third on that page sais that Litvinov and his daughter came to a meal and that Stalin was desirous of seeing Mr. Davies personally.

de

The fourth on page 2 relates to the border situation between Manchukuo and the USSR in March, 1938, and that Mr. Litvinov expressed the opinion that Japan was too much tied up in China to contemplate any immediate military aggression against the USSR.

The last one on page two expresses the same opinion and, further, that, while the Soviet Government did not conceal its deep sympathy for China, it was meticulously careful to maintain peace with Japan.

The fifth, undated -- the first one on page 3, undated, is Mr. Davies' estimate of the financial situation in the USSR at some unnamed period and the proportion being devoted to preparations for possible war, and gives various estimates by unnamed persons, one of which is twice as high as the other, as to the strength of Soviet forces in the Far Fast and rumors as to the total strength of the Soviet Army.

The next item, undated, relates that fascist governments are trying to isolate the USSR, and the USSR is accepting that position.

In the last item on that page Mr. Litvinov is said to have adopted the perfectly proper attitude,

4 5

in answer to a Japanese protest against their supplying arms to China, that it was in accordance with the principles of international law.

On page 4, in the first item, Mr. Davies expresses his personal opinion that there is no world danger from communism.

In the second item, undated, he reports the opinion of the French Ambassador as to Stalin's reasons for supporting the Comintern.

In the next item he reports the opinion of a Mr. Blake, United States Vice Consul at Kobe, as to the state of affairs in Japan.

In the last item on that page he reports his best judgment and also, at the end of paragraph 1, his impression as to the then state of affairs in June, 1938, as between Russia and Japan. He gives some estimates from unnamed sources as to the strength of Soviet and Japanese troops in the Far East and reports a statement by Litvinov that the Japanese were buying up rubles on the black market.

In the first undated item on page 5, he expresses his opinion as to the controlling power in the Communist Party in the USSR.

In the next undated item from a summary he expresses his information, from unnamed sources, as

to the strength and quality of Soviet armed forces.

In the last undated item on that page he summarizes his opinion as to the relations between the United States, the Soviets and Japan.

In the first item on the last page, September 16, 1929, he gives his opinion about the state of affairs following the outbreak of the European War and about the effect of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Agreement.

In the second item on that page he expresses his opinion that Stalin's whole plan since 1926 had been to confine his attention to developing the internal prosperity of the Soviet Union.

In the last item but one he summarizes his opinion of three months of war at the end of November, 1939 and of the real effect of the German-Russian Non-Agression Pact.

In the last item he expresses his opinion as to the war between Russia and Finland.

I am sorry to have had to detain the Tribunal by going through this in detail, but there seemed no other way.

THE PRESIDENT: We anticipate a lengthy reply by Mr. Cunningham. If possible, we would like to have a simultaneous translation of Mr. Cunningham's

2

5

6

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

20

'21

22

23 24

```
reply to save time. We will not take his reply be-
  fore Monday.
            We will adjourn until half-past nine on
 3
 4 Monday morning.
                  (Whereupon, at 1600, an adjourn-
 5
        ment was taken until Monday, 9 June 1947
 6
       at 0930.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```